(SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN)

Speaker was pleased to say that it rests with the Leader of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have already said that it is the Leader of the House who determined the period for which this Assembly should sit. It is the Leader of the House who gives work. I determine the time we should sit.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Gubbi).—Shall we take it for granted that there is no work?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ.—ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಕೆಲಸ ಸರಕಾರದ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಈಗ ಇದೆ. ಕೆಲಸವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಬೇಗ ಮುಗಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ನನಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೀವು ನಿರ್ಧಾರಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ (ಮೈಸೂರು).—ಸಭೆಯ ನಡುವಳಿಕೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ನನಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನೇ ಕೊಡುವದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಇದನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸಿಬಿಡೋಣ.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I just want to know what has happened to my letter to the Speaker requesting to fix time for discussing the Public Service Commission Report. I am not allowed to draw attention to that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is under my consideration.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ನಾನು ಕಾಗದ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದರೂ ಸಹ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಇಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರೂ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಗಮನಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನಡವಳಿಕೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕ್ರಮಬದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ನಿಂತು ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಭೆಯು ಮುಂದಿರುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಟ್ಟು ಕ್ರಮಬದ್ಧವಾಗಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಉಚ್ಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆ ಅಂಥವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊನೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಾವು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಧಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಈಗ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇರುವ ಮುಂದಿನ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗೋಣ.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

SECRETARY.—I beg to lay on the Table of the House.—

The Mysore Public Service Commission (Conduct of Business and Additional Functions) Bill, 1958,

The Mysore Maternity Benefit Bill, 1958,

The Cotton Ginning and Pressing Factories (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1958, and

The Mysore Societies Registration Bill, 1958, as passed by the Legislative Council.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Minister for Public Works and Electricity).—Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a Supplementary financial statement of the Mysore State Electricity Board as required under Section 61 (5) of the Indian Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948.

REPORT OF THE BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Sri L H. THIMMA BOVI (Deputy Speaker).—I move:

"That the Assembly agrees with the eighth Report of the Business Advisory Committee."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Assembly agrees with the eighth Report of the Business Advisory Committee."

The motion was adopted.

MADRAS PRESERVATION OF PRIVATE FORESTS CONTINUANCE BILL, 1958.

Motion to consider.

Sri K. F. PATIL (Minister for Agriculture)—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests Continuance Bill, 1958, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests Continuance Bill 1958, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

Sri K. F. PATIL.—Sir, this is a Bill whose life was extended last year. The extension period ends in December 1958. Since a common law with regard to private forests as well as district forest, is being considered by the Government, it will not be completed

by the end of December. Hence the continuance of the existing Private Forests Act is necessary to prevent private owners of private forests from felling without taking into consideration the rules and regulations of the Forest Department. In order to prevent the forests from being cut, this Bill is being introduced for continuance of the operation of the present enactment for one year more. The Bill provides that the present provisions may be extended up to the end of December 1959.

I therefore commend this Bill for acceptance of this Hon'ble House.

*Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Mysore).—While extending my support to this Bill, I find it very necessary to make a few remarks which would be rather not quite pleasant to Government.

Sir, the Hon'ble Minister was pleased to say that the introduction of a common law or a unifrom Act is now under the consideration of the Government. I do not know, Sir, what the Hon'ble Minister meant by it. Sir, as far as I know, there was no such law in the erstwhil Mysore State and I believe Sir, there is not also such an Act in the erstwhile Bombay Karnatak. That being so, I cannot understand the Hon'ble Minister when he says that the Government are actively considering the introduction of uniform Act.

Sir, the history of this enactment in Madras State also is very interesting. This Act was passed in the year 1946 and later on probably, Sir, the term of that enactment had to be extended by an ordinance and finally the Madras Legislature passed an Act in the year 1949. Sir, the Preamble to that Act reads like this :

> "This is an Act to prevent indiscriminate destruction of private forests and interference with customary and prescriptive rights therein and for certain other purposes."

Sir, it further reads :

> "Where it is necessary, pending further legislation, to prevent indiscriminate destruction of private forests and interference with customary and prescriptive rights therein, it is hereby enacted as follows:"

Sir, this Legislation has come into force in 1949. We are thesuccessor legislative body as far as South Canara is concerned. This enactment is in force in South Canara District .....

Sri K. F. PATIL.—And also in Kollegal.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—And Kollegal. Sir, that Legislature has taken nearly seven to eight years to consider what type of permanet legislation was necessary and it had gone on almost mechanically till 1946. Thereafter also, I believe Sir, this matter has not been considered by the Government in all its details. Last year, the Government promulgated an ordinance extending the period of that enactment up to 2nd December 1958. Then also some members of the Assembly raised the point as to the necessity of further extending the period of this enactment. Sir, whenever a period is prescribed for an enactment to be in force, it is done with a definite purpose. It is not a permanent piece of legislation. Last year, the Government promised to consider this matter and tell this House whether this enactment should continue in force and if so, in what form. This year again, Sir, because the period is running out, the Government is anxious to extend the period of enactment to be in force from 2nd December 1958 to 2nd December 1959. This leaves a feeling in my mind that the Government have not bestowed sufficient thought on this question. I wish Sir, that during the year 1959 at least, the Government will make up its mind and tell this House as to the necessity of this Legislation and if there should be any need for a permanent piece of legislation what it shouldbe.

With these remarks, Sir, I support this Bill.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA (Mangalore–1).–Sir, the principle or the policy involved in this Bill is a very important one. I am happy to know that a number of Ministers are present so that I may place my views at a time they will also hear.

Sir, the principle is to preserve all private forests and the preservation of forests, private or public, is a matter of policy which has consequences far-

(SRI B. VAIKUNT BALIGA)

reaching in nature. It was in that light that when the monsoon was a bit irregular, a committee was appointed by the Central Government to go into the matter and that committee suggested that the failure of monsoon was attributable to the denudation of forests on a very extensive scale which was going on. The Madras State bestowed its attention and passed this legislation. I do not know why or how the matter did not attract attention in other parts particularly in erstwhile Mysore State; is it because the forest area is more abundant in the old Mysore State than in the integrating areas? At any rate, so far as South Canara is concerned, that is the area that comes from the old Madras State as such it has substantial importances and therefore Sir, I say that this is a matter on which the attention of the Government should have been bestowed very early. I learn and I have reason to believe that the Government did bestow attention and called for a report and that report had come a fairly long time back. But why there should have been any delay in coming to any conclusion is a matter on which I am yet to be acquainted or enlightened. Sir, I say that delay with regard to this is rather bad. Last time, when this enactment was extended till 2nd December 1958 it was done with the definite purpose that uniform law or necessary legislation would be brought. I do not know Sir, whay the Government is saying that it is stil under consideration. It is not such a complicated matter that would merit the delay which has occurred. Sir, I would therefore appeal to the Government with all the earnestness I can command that delay should be avoided. It is a matter on which permanent legislation should be done and which can be a uniform legislation. Forest area does not make any distinction with regard to territorial location whether it is South Canara or North Canara or Shimoga or Hassan or Coorg or any other place. If the

10 A.M.

Government feels that there is greater need to make provision in the statute, there should not have been any delay at all. Without analysing the reason that has led to the delay I support the Bill. I only request the Government and the Minister to do all necessary things in time and not at the end of the period try to say that a little more time is needed. This is a very important matter and I am sure the Government will not fail to devote proper attention and bring in a legislation not extending it for a little area here and there, but one uniform legislation applicable to the whole of State. Incidentally, I would like to say that the Government should examine not only preserving forests but also where exploitation is permitted under the statute, to see that something is done for afforestation. It should devote attention towards afforestation not only of the quantitative timber or the timber that is now available but also the particular varieties to meet our requirements instead of being imported from outside. I may mention that there is a great need for a particular kind of timber, *viz.*, teak timber. It is a remunerative enterprise. The Forest Department can work it out with profit and that will also help the finances of the State. As to the effect that the subject matter should have received earlier attention at the hands of the Government, this requires further consideration. With these observations I have no hesitation in supporting this Bill.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಎಂ. ಬನವೇಗೌಡ (ಚಿಕ್ಕಮಗಳೂರು).—ಸ್ಪಾಮಿ, ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಸಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತ ನಾನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹೊಸರಾಜ್ಯವಾವಮೇಲೆ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕವಾವಮೇಲೆ ನುವಾರು ಮೂರವತ್ತು ಒಂದು ಭಾಗ ಮಾತ್ರವಾಡು ಪ್ರದೇಶವಾಗಿವೆ ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ವತಿಯಿಂದ ಫಾರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಕಾಲೇಜನ್ನು ಮುಚ್ಚಲಾಡಿರುವ ಯಾ ತಾವಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು, uniform Bill ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೂಡಲೇ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಕಾಡುಗಳು ನಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಮಗಳೂರು ಅಥವ ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಫಾರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಕಾಲೇಜನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

*SRI G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palaiyam).—My points have already been touched upon by my friends. I am yet doubtful about bringing in a comprehen-

sive Bill in this matter before the end of December 1959. This question has to be considered in the light of the land legislation Bill that is to be brought before the House. They are very many people who are afraid that anything might to be done in respect of private forests. So, they are misusing those private forests. I want the Government to take neces ary action in respect of private forests from now on so that they may not misuse them just to escape from the land legislation.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಫ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈ ಬಿಲ್ ನಲುವಾಗಿ ನೂಕ್ತ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀಯುತರು ಗಳಾದ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಬಿ. ವೈಕುಂಠಬಾಳಿಗ ಮತ್ತು ಜಿ. ವೆಂಕಟೇಗೌಡರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬಹಳ ತಡ ಏಕೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆನ್ನುವುದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ವೆಂದು ಒಬ್ಬರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಉದ್ದೇಶಪೂರ್ವಕ ವಾಗಿ ತಡ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಕೆಲವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ದರು. ಮತ್ತೆ ಕೆಲವರು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಕೆಲವರು ಆತುರತೆಯಿಂದ uniform ಬಿಲ್ ಆಗದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಪ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಫಾರಸ್ಟು ಗಳು ಹಾಳಾಗುತ್ತವೆ ಮತ್ತು land reforms legislationಗೆ ಕೂಡ ಅನೇಕ ಅನಾಹುತಗಳಾಗುತ್ತ ವೆನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಈ ಮೂರು ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಅವಶ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳ ಬೇಕಾದುವು. ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ಣ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ತಂದಿಲ್ಲವೆನ್ನತಕ್ಕ ಆರೋಪಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಎಳ್ಳಷ್ಟೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಪ್ರಿಸರ್ವೇಷನ್ ಆಫ್ ಪ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಫಾರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನೇ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕಾ ಗಿತ್ತು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಾದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. Re-integration ಆದಮೇಲೆ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಕೆಲವು ಕಲಮುಗಳಿವೆ. ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಫಾರೆಸ್ಟ್ಸ್ ಹೇಗೆ ಕಂಟ್ರೋಲ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು 1953 ರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿನಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾಗ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೆ. ಆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈಗ ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಯಾವುದನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಕಾಯಬೇಕೋ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಕಾಯಬೇಕು. ಇವು ಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಹಾಗೆ ಬಾಂಬೆ ಮೂಲ ಆಕ್ಟಿ ನಲ್ಲಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಏನಿದೆ ಅದರ ಕಲ್ಪನೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಇದ್ದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರು ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಏನೋ. Uniform legislation ತರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಮದ ರಾಸ್ ಪ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಫಾರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕೆಲವು ಕಲಮುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು uniform legislation ಮಾಡುವುದರ ನಲುವಾಗಿ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಇಲಾಖೆ consider ಮಾಡಿ ರಾ ಇಲಾಖೆಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ. It is being worked. ಮುಂದೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಎಂದರೆ ಮುಂದಿನ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದಿರುವ ಭರವಸೆಯನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀ ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರಿಗೂ ಕೊಡ ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರು.—ಅಷ್ಟರೊಳಗೆ ಅರಣ್ಯಗಳು ಹೋಗಿ ಬಿಡುತ್ತವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ ಎಫ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಅದನ್ನು ಹಾಳು ಮಾಡುವಾರದೆನ್ನುವ ನಲುವಾಗಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತರು ತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಪ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಫಾರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮದರಾಸಿನಿಂದ ಬಂದಂಥ ಭಾಗಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟ ರಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಅದರ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋಗುವುದರಿಂದ ಮತ್ತು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಡು ಹಾಳಾಗಿ ಹೋಗಬಹುದೆಂದು ಅವಸರವಾಗಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತರುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಅಮರ್ ಬಜಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ, ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಜ್ಞೆ ಕೊಡ ಬಯಸು ತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ, ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ತಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಮನ್ನಣೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests Continuance Bill, 1958, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Clauses 1 and 2, the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 1 and 2, the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri K. F. PATIL.—I beg to move:

"That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests Continuance Bill, 1958, as passed by the Legislative Council, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests Continuance Bill, 1958, as passed by the Legislative Council, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE RENT CONTROL LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL, 1958.

Motion to consider.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—I beg to move:

"That the Mysore Rent Control Laws Continuance Bill, 1958, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."